

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

A PTO-1449 listing the two references disclosed at page 1 and page 3 of the applicants' specification, with copies of these references, is being filed herewith, as suggested by the Examiner in ¶ 1, page 2 of the action. The Examiner is requested to consider these references and return an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 indicating such consideration.

A new abstract is attached pursuant to ¶ 2, page 2 of the action. The abstract is thought to be consistent with the Examiner's suggestions and its entry is requested.

Regarding the drawings, a replacement sheet for Figure 1 is attached. The new drawing is thought to show the various elements referred to by the Examiner. Thus, the "circuit" is indicated in the replacement sheet together with the "emitter section" and the "receiver section". The word "amplifier" is not shown but has instead been deleted as unnecessary from claims 10 and 11 as these claims have otherwise been amended. Entry of the attached replacement and withdrawal of the objections to the drawings are requested.

The claims have been amended as essentially suggested by the Examiner to obviate the objections thereto as set out in ¶ 4, pages 3-5 of the action.

Reconsideration of these objections is, therefore, requested.


The claims have also been amended, taking into account the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 3-4 and 6-9 under Section 112, 2nd ¶. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

The Examiner is also requested to reconsider the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 6. This claim has been returned to its original form in depending from claim 1 with some minor changes which are thought to improve the clarity of the claim. Since claim 6 now depends from claim 1 and the latter has been indicated to be allowable over the art, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 should also be allowable. Clearly, the Examiner's references (Shinji et al. and Westlund), no matter how considered, do not in any sense make the applicants' invention as defined in claim 6 obvious. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejection is requested.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 10 and 11 are allowable and that claims 1, 3-4 and 7-9 would be allowable once these claims are amended to overcome the rejection(s) under Section 112, 2nd ¶. Such amendments have been made and, in the circumstances, allowance of all the claims, including amended claim 6, is thought to be in order and is requested.

Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP



By _____

Paul N. Kokulis
Reg. No. 16773

Date: April 28, 2005

Customer No. 09629

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Phone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001

Direct: (202) 739-5455